REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 45, and 67 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 and 45-67 are pending and under consideration.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule §116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1, 45, and 67 puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised. (See, for example, paragraphs [0040], [0045], [0048], and [0050] to [0052] and FIGs. 3, 5, and 7).

TRAVERSE

In item 14, the Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 45, and 67 (and respective dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 46-50, 52, 53, and 55) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anwar (US Pub. 2001/0047355). (Action at pages 6-10).

In items 15-24, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 7, 10, 12-21, 51, 54, and 56-66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anwar in view of combinations of Ortega (U.S.P. 6,401,084 B1), Ferrel et al. (U.S.P. 5,907,837), Rose (U.S.P. 5,752,244), Kerven et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0042784 A1), Talib et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0044758 A1), Henkin et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0107735 A1) and Schultz (U.S.P. 5,640,553). (Action at pages 11-29).

The rejections are traversed.

In contrast to the cited art independent claims 1, 45, and 67, all as amended, respectively recite a query-and-response processing method, a computer readable medium, and a query-and-response processing apparatus, using claim 1 as an example, including, "analyzing said search request provided by said user; generating search criteria based on a result of the analysis of said search request; searching said database according to the generated search criteria; analyzing an intention of the query based on the result of the analysis of said search request, a query intention analyzing module analyzing an intention of the query based on the result of the analysis of said search request, wherein the analyzing comprises: determining whether said search request includes an interrogative, and extracting a component qualified by the interrogative in a case said search request includes an interrogative or extracting a top level component of syntactic hierarchy of said search request in a case said search request does not include an interrogative; an output formatting module selecting items to be presented to the user,

wherein the formatting comprises determining an output format of search results according to a result of said analysis of the intention of said query without further input by the user; and a presentation module receiving the result of said output formatting process to present data to said user."

That is, according to aspects of the present invention:

1) when selecting a component to be a topic from a query, a word modified by an interrogative in the query, if any, is extracted;

2) when selecting a component to be a topic from a query, if there is no interrogative in the query, a component in the top level in the syntactic hierarchy based on the result of parsing analysis is extracted; and

3) the process of determining the output format is performed without further input by the. user.

Applicant submits that Anwar does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not discussing features recited in the present application's independent claims as a whole. As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must discuss every aspect of a claimed invention.

Further, Applicants submit that the recited features are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner, alone or in *arguendo* combinations. As set forth in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

The Examiner mistakenly contends that the process of extracting a topic from a query according to the present invention is discussed by Anwar's discussion of a extraction process.

Anwar does not extract a topic of an interrogative sentence inputted as a query. Rather, Anwar merely discusses a process for extracting a topic from a query by selecting an operable component which is prepared in advance. For example, as discussed by Anwar, a system selects a word "drink" from a query "Profit of drink in CA." Then, from the selected word "drink", Anwar discussion of expansion into instances of a "drink" class and extraction of a word "Coke" that is provided as one of instances of the "drink" class. (See, for example, FIG. 7A and paragraph [0082].)

Applicants submit that it is understood in the art that in a system as discussed in Anwar, general nouns are prepared in advance and are provided as a class that includes a variety of selectable words, and the class of a general noun of concern is selected from a query.

Accordingly, in the system as discussed by Anwar, even if another query that is an interrogative sentence having a different construction is inputted, then the same word is selected.

Anwar does not discuss, in the lines cited or any where else, reference, any discussion concerning a process with which _different_ words are selected depending on the difference in construction of interrogative sentences inputted as queries.

In addition, according to an aspect of the present invention, in an extraction process as recited by independent claims 1, 45, and 67, a component that is to be a topic is extracted "using the result of syntactic analysis" for interrogative sentence inputted as a query.

For example, according to aspects of the present application (see, for example, paragraphs [0040], [0045], [0048], and [0050 to 0052] and FIGs. 3 and 5) a "query intention analyzer 16" performs a process determining the intention of an inputted query based on the result of parsing executed by "search request analyzer 12." (See, for example, paragraph [0052] and FIG. 7 that discuss that "query intention analyzer 16" performs a different process in the selection of a component in the top level depending on whether it is a noun phrase or verb phrase.)

In contrast to the art relied on by the Examiner, "query intention analyzer 16" operates:

1) if a query includes a sentence component that is modified by an interrogative, the component is determined to be a topic, using the result of analysis for an interrogative sentence of the query. For example, if the query sentence contains "What drink does Pepsico sell in US," "drink" is selected as a topic of the query;

2) however, if there is no sentence component modified by an interrogative in the query, the top level element in the sentence is determined to be a topic. For example, if the query sentence contains "Keyboards sold by Yamaha", "keyboard" is selected. If the query sentence contains "Does Yamaha sell any keyboards in US?", "sell" is selected.

As an example to illustrate recited features according to the present invention and the art relied on by the Examiner, assuming that phrases including the following three queries are inputted:

1: "Profit of drink"
2: "Profitable drink maker"
3: "Top-sales drink".

According to aspects of the present invention the following terms are extracted from the three queries:

Word 1 extracted from query sentence 1: "Profit"

Word 2 extracted from query sentence 2: "maker"

Word 3 extracted from query sentence 8: "drink".

On the other hand, a system as discussed by Anwar alone, or in *arguendo* combinations, with the other art relied on by the Examiner would merely extract the single term "Coke"

Summary

Since features recited by the claims are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims 1-22 and 45-67 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _August 15, 2005_   By: _Paul W. Bobowiec_

Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501